



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## TRUSTEES' SECTION

The Trustees' Section held a meeting on Friday, June 22, with W. T. Porter in the chair, and Thomas L. Montgomery as secretary.

Mrs. Elizabeth Claypool Earl, president of the Public Library Commission of Indiana, gave an interesting description of the Indiana Trustees' Association and said that the formation of the association had resulted in longer vacations, in better hours of work and in a more generous provision for the payment for the services of librarians. The trustees had a better idea of what trained service is worth. Incidentally it may be said that the affiliation of trustees with the state associations is growing in favor. It is comparatively easy for trustees to attend a meeting once a year within the state lines for one day or possibly two, when it is practically impossible for them to follow the A. L. A. meetings to distant points.

Mr. Bowker spoke upon "The Carnegie contracts: Duty of trustees with reference thereto." Sixty-five million dollars have been spent by Mr. Carnegie and the Carnegie Corporation on over 3,000 buildings. Mr. Bowker estimated that five per cent of the libraries were delinquent in making reports to the Carnegie Corporation and quoted the names of three northern and three southern states which had been very derelict. In one case a Carnegie gift had actually been sold as a private residence; in another the building had been torn down, leaving only the remains of the walls in testimony of Mr. Carnegie's generosity. Mr. Bowker's remarks led to a discussion as to the legality of the usual Carnegie contract with the municipalities. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to draw an agreement which will bind any particular community for longer than the life of the local council or board. It was Mr. Carnegie's idea to have what might be termed a "gentlemen's agreement" in all such matters.

Mr. Brett briefly reviewed the work of

a committee appointed by the executive board of the A. L. A. to investigate the question of delinquencies on library contracts, stating that some progress had been made in obtaining reports showing that many delinquent libraries were making up their obligations.

In the discussion that followed Dr. F. P. Hill stated that the ten per cent agreement did not furnish adequate support with which to carry on the library, and that eighteen to twenty per cent was needed to have the work performed satisfactorily.

Mr. Edmund C. Craig, trustee of the Evansville Library, read a paper on

### LIBRARY LEGISLATION

(See p. 226)

Mr. W. Dawson Johnston, of the St. Paul Public Library, read a paper entitled

SHOULD LIBRARIES BE UNDER THE GENERAL CIVIL SERVICE OF THE STATE OR HAVE

A SEPARATE CIVIL SERVICE ORGANIZATION?

(See p. 229)

He said in part: "The unhappy condition of a number of libraries under civil service control, the desire of progressive civil service authorities to improve the civil service, and the movement among librarians to standardize library service, make it desirable that there should be agreement between civil service and library authorities with regard to these principles in library administration." He brought up four suggestions as to the selection of civil service officials, the coördination of commissions and the standardizations of examinations, the coöperation with professional bodies in the elevation and maintenance of professional standards and the impossibility of always securing the best candidates through formal examinations.

In the discussion that followed Mr. Johnston's paper it was evident that librarians generally approve of a civil service within the library, but were not

ready to abide by the decisions of a state civil service commission.

Mr. Thomas A. Barker, of Louisville, read a paper on "Taxation and the apportionment of the proceeds to the respective needs of the library."

On account of lack of time, a general discussion upon the subject "Is the county the proper unit for library service?" was omitted from the program.

THOMAS L. MONTGOMERY,  
Secretary.

## PUBLIC DOCUMENTS ROUND TABLE

The meeting was called to order in the Seelbach Hotel at 9:30 a. m., June 26, by the chairman, Mr. George S. Godard. He spoke briefly on the subject of the distribution of public documents and called attention to round table discussions heretofore and Mr. George H. Carter's work in connection with the subjects under investigation by this section, now being considered. The following letter from Mr. Carter was read by Mr. Redstone:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Joint Committee on Printing.

April 24, 1917.

Mr. George S. Godard,  
Chairman, Committee on Public Documents,  
American Library Association.

My dear Mr. Godard:

I am pleased to acknowledge receipt of your letters of April 16 and 19, 1917, asking me to prepare a statement as to the status of printing legislation for the information of the Public Documents Round Table at its session in Louisville in June. I thank you for the very kind invitation to be present at that meeting but it will be impossible for me to accept. In truth, I do not feel like facing the Round Table again until I am able to bring it a more acceptable message as to what Congress has actually done for the benefit of the libraries. I fear your Association has grown weary of hearing what the Committee hopes and plans to accomplish in the way of printing legislation. All of that has been fully explained with the generous indulgence of the Documents Round Table. I shall, therefore, endeavor to make this statement as brief as possible, for there is really little to tell you at this time except the old, and undoubtedly tiresome, story of how near the Committee came to getting the printing bill enacted into law at the last session of Congress.

In the first place, the statement which I

made at the Asbury Park meeting fully sets forth the status of the printing bill which the House of Representatives had under consideration at that time. Mr. Barnhart of Indiana, chairman of the House Committee on Printing, was unable to get that bill before the House again during the remainder of the Sixty-fourth Congress and it consequently died with the Congress. The Committee was much encouraged, however, over the fact that the House had approved of substantially half the Barnhart bill during the two days it was under consideration. The similar bill in the Senate advanced no further than a favorable report from the Senate Committee on Printing, the calendar of the Senate, like that of the House, being filled with more important legislation which crowded out everything else from consideration by either body during the Sixty-fourth Congress.

Toward the close of the last session of Congress, the Senate Committee on Printing made another effort to have some printing legislation enacted by Congress so as to insure the immediate adoption of certain economies proposed in the original printing bill. An abridgment was made of the old bill by taking from it those sections which related particularly to printing and binding and the distribution of publications for Congress, leaving out those provisions which related more especially to the Government Printing Office and the various departments. This abridged bill made only 28 pages, while the original bill consisted of 129 pages. The new bill was generally called the "congressional" printing bill. It was reported from the Senate Committee on Printing by Senator Chilton, the new chairman of that committee, on January 11, 1917, as "S. Bill No. 7795." It met with no opposition whatever and was passed unanimously by the Senate without amendment on February 6, 1917. This new bill also received the approval of the House Committee on Printing, and Mr. Barnhart, chairman of that committee, made several efforts to have it considered